UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**

Duty to Civilization (*Part VIII*)

By FRANCIS NEILSON

John Ruskin

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

The East of Romance

By FREDERICK STARR

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 21

Chicago, August 4, 1921

PUBLISHED BI-WEEKLY

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—
Notes.—J. H. H. 323
Duty to Civilization. VIII.—Francis Neilson 325

CONTRIBUTED—
Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature. IX. John Ruskin.—George Willis Cooke 329
The German Pacifist Student Federation.—Alfred Schneyder 331
The Wisdom of the Peoples. IV. The Proverbs of China. —James Waldo Fawcett 332

THE BOOK TABLE—
The East of Romance.—Frederick Starr 333

SELECTED—
National Purification.—*Gandhi* 334

POETRY—
Two Fires.—*Harriet L. Jones* 323
Nocturne.—James Waldo Fawcett 329
Two Lacquer Prints.—*Amy Lowell* 333

THE FIELD—
Frederick Starr Back from Japan 335
How May Japan Avoid War with the United States 335

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

Vol. LXXXVII THURSDAY, AUGUST 4, 1921 Number 21

TWO FIRES.

I.

Within the circled fire we crouch secure,
Within the circled fire that keeps at bay
The snarling prowlers with their hell-lit eyes
Darting the flames of hate. Ah, well they'd prize
The carcass of the man-child for their prey!
We lit their fire of hate when on a day
Our weapons slew their mates, their offspring dear
And now if one of us unarmed, alone,
Should seek the jungle yonder, dark, unknown
Forth with avenging roar would spring our fear!

II.

So hell pays hate for hate; yet, sounding clear
Adown the ages, hear St. Francis sing;
How all the creatures were our brothers born;
That each will love us if we love in turn;
That love wins love and will the brighter burn
When ruthless slaughter is by man forsworn.
For he who slays becomes a man forlorn:
He hates the thing he slays, he fears it too;
Its image haunts his mind, suspicion-fed;
His pilgrimage he makes in shoes of lead
Which else on wings of joy he would pursue.

III.

But love, quoth Francis, never causeth rue.
It lures the creature to its highest will;
It blesses life and never seeks to kill;
Its flame secures the folk from wild alarm
And draws them each to each, for to its charm
The spirit yields and savage breasts are still.

—*Harriet L. Jones.*

The Social Preparation.

We take off our hat to President Harding! He has confounded our criticism, and put to shame our scorn. Before our recent editorial complaint at the inaction of his administration had had time to appear in print, he had fulfilled his campaign promise of peace with Germany by signing the Knox Resolution, had displayed an altogether unexpected Grover-Cleveland-type of courage in setting his face against the disgraceful Bonus Bill, and best of all had placed the United States in the forefront of the world's hope by calling the international conference on disarmament and world order. This is a triumphant celebration of the fourth (monthly) anniversary of his inauguration, and a bid for such prestige as no man has enjoyed since the day that Woodrow Wilson set sail for Europe. For ourselves, we are glad to be thus confounded, and eat without distaste our generous dish of "humble pie." Mr. Harding, especially by his action in summoning the nations to the council table, has honestly won the leadership at home and abroad which he now enjoys; and we sincerely hope, for his sake as well as for infinitely deeper reasons, that the great meeting now expected to assemble in Washington in November, may do what Versailles so tragically failed to do. We confess to ardent hope, for we believe that, once these nations are gathered again in conference, the public opinion of the world will not let them separate without something done.

It would be foolish, however, to let our optimism blind us to the obstacles that stand in the way of a successful outcome of President Harding's conference. First of all there is the difficulty deliberately inserted by the President himself in calling for a discussion of Pacific and Far East problems. The New York *World* well points out that if the conference does not succeed in settling such issues of dispute and misunderstanding as Shantung, Yap, Saghalien Island, the California anti-Japanese legislation, mandates in the Pacific, and the Anglo-Japanese alliance, "there is little chance that the ostensible purpose of the conference will prevail." It is indubitable that adherence to Senator Borah's scheme would have been a much wiser plan! Then, too, we are not stopping our naval program. The building of the great ships is still going on at a pace to beat the world. All of which means that we are inviting the great powers to come into our parlor and talk things over, while holding stoutly behind our back a big stick for instant use! Lastly, there are still at work those fundamental factors of capitalistic organization which make war a necessary part of our international system. To call a conference on disarmament under such circumstances, says the *Freeman,* "seems to us much like trying to dam the Mississippi with a three-tined fork." Nevertheless, we are incorrigibly optimistic; we see these things, and still hope on. It must never be forgotten that the situation is now so bad that we are on the very edge of universal catastrophe. It is at such times that miracles are done.

Lloyd-George is another man who has confounded us. With his usual agility, he has seized upon the Irish question, and brought it to a stage of negotiation which had long seemed to be impossible. In the Premier's case, however, unlike the President's, we feel no repentance, and offer no amends. For what Lloyd-George has just now done in recognizing Sinn Fein, he could have done months ago. The blood of thousands of men and women, the misery of the whole population of the country of Ireland, nameless indignities, tortures and oppressions—all these are on his head, and nothing that he does at this late day can wipe out the memory of such crimes.

He stands with Alva and Ivan the Terrible, as one of the butchers of history. Furthermore, when the whole story of reconciliation is told, we are convinced that it will be shown that it was General Smuts and not Lloyd-George who initiated and accomplished the diplomatic discussions. This great South African again looms up at a crisis in the world's affairs, as a consummate leader in all the ways of wisdom, forbearance and good will.

The refusal of the Harvard Board of Overseers to "discipline" Professor Chaffee for the crime of writing and publishing his book, "Freedom of Speech," ends an episode which is as ridiculous as it is discreditable to the alumni of the Harvard Law School who petitioned for action, and creditable to the Board which declined to take such action. Think of a group of able men not seeing in the "discipline" which they desired the demonstration of the truth of the indictment laid down in the offending book! If Professor Chaffee lacked any final proof of his thesis, here it was, presented on a silver platter so to speak, by those who sought his undoing. To those who have read "Freedom of Speech," it must ever be a source of amazement that anybody could take exception to the volume, save perhaps some radicals who might be tempted to impatience at the author's moderation of spirit, and his opinion that there are limits, especially in war-time, beyond which free speech cannot be carried. The book is essentially a work of scholarship. It recites the tradition and precedent of English law, presents a careful history of events in the United States under the operation of the Sedition Acts, and offers a sober philosophical interpretation of the ethical and social principles involved. The text contains not a hasty word, not a single rash opinion. We wonder, as we consider the hue and cry raised against this volume, if the body of John Stuart Mill rests safely in its grave. Is there not danger that somebody today may chance to read "Liberty," and in fury disinter the author's ashes and fling them to the winds!

Like an unbroken refrain sounds the testimony as to the corruptive influences of war. Here comes William B. Joyce, latest in a procession of witnesses, who as president of the National Surety Company analyzes the causes of the present nation-wide crime wave. First among eleven causes, he places "widespread lessening of respect for law and order." This "lessening of respect for law," he says, "follows every war and is manifested today throughout our country and the entire world by individuals in many social classes both high and low. War makes many people more cynical and callous, more indifferent to human suffering and the rights of others." As we read these words we find ourselves wondering what Mr. Joyce was saying four years ago. Was he arguing that war is morally uplifting? Was he pointing out how service at the front was going to bring about the spiritual regeneration of our young men? Was he proclaiming that military training and experience taught discipline, obedience, sense of order, and reverence for the rights of others? If not, hundreds of thousands of other men were lifting this chorus. And the few who dared to say what Mr. Joyce is saying today were all denounced as liars, pro-Germans, traitors, and many of them cast into prison for their opinion. We recall that, years ago, there was a popular musical comedy called "The Yankee Consul," in which Mr. Raymond Hitchcock sang a topical song on the words, "Ain't it funny what a difference a few hours make"!

We have just been reading a pamphlet descriptive of the English convict ship, "Success," now lying in New York harbor—and we find ourselves feeling more cheerful and optimistic than we have felt for months. This ship is the oldest vessel now afloat upon the seven seas, having been launched at Morelmein, British India, in 1790. From 1802 to 1851, she was a part of the famous felon fleet, engaged under the barbarous penal laws of the day, in transporting convicts to Australia and other distant colonies. "In the brief space available here," says the author of the pamphlet, "not even an idea can be given of the ghastly horrors" perpetrated on this ship. Enough is said, however, to indicate clearly enough that the "Success" was a floating hell. Airless dungeons and condemned cells, whipping posts, manacles, branding irons, punishment balls, leaden-tipped cat-o'-nine-tails, the coffin bath—these are some of the fiendish inventions of torture which made up the equipment of her voyages. The Black Holes, in which prisoners were punished in "solitary" for periods from one to a hundred days, were

> small tapering chambers measuring only two feet eight inches across. The doors fit as tight as valves, excluding all air except what can filter through the perforated iron plate which was placed over the bars above the door, to make the hole as dark and oppressive as possible. A stout iron ring is fastened about knee high in the shelving back of the cell, and through this ring the right hand of the prisoner was passed, and then handcuffed to the left wrist, the consequence being that he was thus prevented from standing upright or lying down, and was obliged to stoop or lean against the shelving side of the vessel as it rolled to and fro.

It is unspeakably horrible to think of the human agony which this old hulk has witnessed—the misery and death which stalked her decks for years. But we are cheerful, because these things are gone forever, our vilest prisons know nothing of such tortures. After all, man registers some progress in his wayward career.

A new poet has arisen—one who promises immeasurably great things. This poet is a woman, and her

name is the curiously rhythmic name of Edna St. Vincent Millay. A young woman, still in her twenties, we believe, she has already produced work which stamps her faculty, in the judgment of that excellent poet and critic, Louis Untermeyer, as "genius, not a mere pretty talent." Miss Millay first came into prominence through her poem, "Renascence," which has been described by Frank Harris as "the greatest poem written in America since 'When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd.'" Since then have appeared occasional short pieces—lyrics, elegies, meditations—all of which have had the authentic cry. Now come two little volumes which end all doubt as to the essential genius of this wonderful girl. One is a collection of short poems, entitled "Second April," containing pieces of ineffable loveliness. The other is a five-act poetical drama, "The Lamp and the Bell," written for the recent anniversary celebration of the founding of the Vassar Alumnæ Association. It is almost paralyzing to think of what Miss Millay may do, if she fulfills the promise contained in these two books. Already she has won rank among the greatest poets of our day. Tomorrow she may seize easily and firmly the crown of immortality.

Dr. Henry C. McComas reveals much of the true inwardness of religious denominationalism in his "Psychology of Religious Sects." He lays bare the central fact in the situation when he says,

> The differences which appear in the religious life of different denominations have their only justification in the differences of human dispositions and not in any divine preference. Nothing is more necessary today than the proclamation of this fact, for the heart of sectarianism is the belief that each sect is a divine favorite. When all religious people freely acknowledge that their differences are matters of individual tastes and temperaments, the real barriers to church unity will be torn away.

Denominationalism, in other words, has its origin in human frailty and not in divine wisdom. We are people of one idea, that is all; and being essentially egoistic, we insist upon confusing our own idea with the universal will of God. If we could only learn a little humility, and come to understand that opinions belong essentially to the individual, not to the social group, least of all to what we know and recognize as God, then we should learn to relegate our opinions to the individual life where they belong, and form our religious associations on the basis of the common life in the community. The scandal of denominationalism will be done away with just as fast and as far as we transfer religion from the field of theology to the field of life, and find the reality of God not in intellectual conformity but in spiritual fellowship.

Duty to Civilization

VIII.

The British and French military authorities had a deeper appreciation of the strategic value of Belgium, in both a political and military sense, than most of the British cabinet. In a military sense, the River Meuse was considered to be the British frontier. The military authorities also knew that in a war between France and Germany, Belgian territory would have to be used as the avenue through which the armies must pass to attack each other. No one was so conscious of this fact as the Belgian Government, and so sure were they that there was a prospect of war affecting their territory that M. Davignon, the Belgian Foreign Minister, as early as July 24th, the day when the Austrian note was presented to Serbia, sent an undated circular to the Belgian Ambassadors saying:

> "All necessary steps to ensure respect of Belgian neutrality have nevertheless been taken by the Government. The Belgian army has been mobilized and is taking up such strategic positions as have been chosen to secure the defence of the country and the respect of its neutrality. The forts of Antwerp and on the Meuse have been put in a state of defence." (Belgian Diplomatic Documents.)

Everything was done by the Belgian Government to protect its eastern frontier, and there the Belgian army was concentrated, not in the west, where Belgium might have been invaded by France or Britain. The first time Grey communicated with Brussels was on July 31st (dispatch No. 115):

> (Telegraphic.)
>
> Foreign Office, July 31, 1914.
>
> "In view of existing treaties, you should inform Minister for Foreign Affairs that, in consideration of the possibility of a European War, I have asked French and German Governments whether each is prepared to respect the neutrality of Belgium provided it is violated by no other Power.
>
> "You should say that I assume that the Belgian Government will maintain to the utmost of her power her neutrality, which I desire and expect other Powers to uphold and observe."

In recording the visit of the British Ambassador to the Belgian Foreign Office, Mr. Davignon said: "The British Minister asked to see me on urgent business and made the following communication, *which he had hoped for some days to be able to present to me.* Further on, in the same document, Mr. Davignon says: "In the course of the ensuing conversation, Sir Francis (British Ambassador) seemed to be somewhat surprised at the speed at which we had decided to mobilize our army." The British Ambassador evidently did not know of the circular note,

which had been issued to the Belgian Ambassadors, to be communicated to the Governments of the guaranteeing Powers, *"should the danger of a war between France and Germany become imminent."* M. Davignon was a man of great sagacity, one who could look far into the future. He was indeed the only diplomatist in Europe, of which we have record in the diplomatic documents published by the Powers, who realized that the integrity and independence of the State of Belgium stood in danger when the Austrian note was handed to Serbia. He did not bother about asking each Power whether it would respect the integrity and independence of Belgium; he went to work at once to prepare for war. He had no faith in the treaties of 1831 or 1839. Quite rightly so, for Belgium had learned in the '80's just how the matter of her neutrality stood. Perhaps it is worth reminding the reader of the controversies that took place in England uring the '80's when the question of Belgium arose, owing to the likelihood of a Franco-German war. *The Spectator,* February 5th, 1887, said:

> "The general idea is that England will be kept out of this war. . . . That she will try to do so we do not doubt, but there is the Belgian difficulty ahead. Our guarantee for her is not a solitary one, and would not bind us to fight alone; but there are general interests to be considered. The probability is that we shall insist on her not becoming a theater of war but shall not bar—as indeed we cannot bar—the traversing of her soil."

Mr. W. T. Stead was the editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* at the time this controversy arose, and in the issues of February 4th and 5th, 1887, he dealt very thoroughly with the question of Belgian neutrality:

> *The Standard* this morning gives special prominence to a letter signed "Diplomaticus" on the neutrality of Belgium. It also devotes its first leading article to the subject. The gist of these utterances may be summed up in two propositions: (1) England is under a treaty of obligation to defend the neutrality of Belgium; (2) but circumstances have altered since the contraction of the said obligation, and as against Germany, at any rate, England must pocket its pledges and allow France to be invaded through Belgium without protesting or interfering.
>
> Considerable importance is likely to be attributed to these conclusions abroad owing to its being understood that *The Standard* is at present the governmental Salisburian organ. Each of the propositions laid down by our contemporary is, it will be seen, likely to be taken hold of. Germany might read the second as an invitation to invade France through Belgium; France might read the first as an admission of our obligation to prevent, or rather to punish, such an infringement of neutral territory, if we dared.

It becomes important, therefore, to point out that *The Standard's* argument rests on a false assumption. We do not for the present argue whether in the contingencies contemplated it would be England's interest to intervene by declaring war against whichever belligerent might violate the neutrality of Belgium; we confine ourselves to the preliminary statement essential for clearing up the case—that it is not England's obligation to do so.

The origin of the mistaken views prevailing on the question is undoubtedly a confusion between the Special Treaty of 1831 and 1839 which is temporarily superseded. By the treaty of 1870 the obligation of England was, of course, clear and specific. Here is the pledge which was given in the identical treaties concluded *mutatis mutandis* with both France and Prussia:

"Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland declares that if during the said hostilities the armies of France (or Prussia) should violate the neutrality of Belgium, she will be prepared to co-operate with his Prussian Majesty (or the Emperor of the French) for the defence of the same in such a manner as may be mutually agreed upon, employing for that purpose her naval and military forces to ensure its observance."

There could be no doubt about that pledge; but then it expired twelve months after the conclusion of peace. At the expiration of that period, so the treaty continued:

"The independence and neutrality of Belgium will, so far as the High Contracting Parties are respectively concerned, continue to rest as heretofore on the first article of the Quintuple Treaty of the 19th of April, 1839."

Now, what some people do is to read this treaty of 1839 by the light of the more specific treaty of 1870, and to deduce from the former the same obligation on the part of England to intervene against any infringement of Belgium's neutrality as was contained in the 1870 treaty.

This, however, is a completely untenable proceeding. The treaty of 1839 must stand on its own legs, and these, it will be seen, are by no means very strong. The following are the terms of its second article:

"His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary and Bohemia, His Majesty the King of the French, Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, His Majesty the King of Prussia, and His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, declare that

the articles hereby annexed to the treaty concluded this day between His Majesty the King of the Belgians and His Majesty the King of the Netherlands, Grand Duke of Luxembourg, are considered as having the same force and value as if they were textually inserted in the present act, and that they are thus placed under the guarantee of their Majesties."

Here, then, we are sent off from the treaty between the Great Powers to the treaty between Belgium and the Netherlands. The seventh article of this treaty (which is identical with the same article of the 1831 treaty) runs:

"Belgium will form, within the limits indicated in 1, 2 and 4, an independent and perpetually neutral State. She will be bound to observe this same neutrality toward all other States."

In this treaty it will be seen there is nothing about any guarantee; all that can be elicited from it, and from the one cited as referring to it, is this, that this clause is placed under the guartee of "their said Majesties," that is, England, Austria, France, Germany and Russia.

But that is not all. This constructive guarantee must be considered in relation to the party to whom it was given—namely to the Netherlands. For the treaty of 1839 was one between the five Powers on the one hand and the Netherlands on the other; and what the five Powers did was to guarantee to the Netherlands the treaty contracted between it and Belgium, one clause of which treaty said that Belgium should form "an independent and perpetually neutral State," and should "be bound to observe such neutrality toward all other States."

In the treaty of 1831, it is true, there was a further article guaranteeing the execution of all preceding articles (including, therefore, the one just cited in similar terms from the 1839 treaty) on which the independence of Belgium is now said to rest, Lord Palmerston omitted any such guarantee.

There is, therefore, no English guarantee to Belgium. It is possible, perhaps, to "construct" such a guarantee; but the case may be summed up as follows: (1) England is under no guarantee whatever except such as is common to Austria, France, Russia and Germany; (2) that guarantee is not specifically of the neutrality of Belgium at all; and (3) is given not to Belgium but to the Netherlands."

Belgium, as a *casus belli,* was a pretext, thought of at the last moment; the question never came before the Cabinet until August 2nd, 1914. During the last week of July, international jurists of repute had shown that England, because she was a signority of the so called Belgian Treaties of 1831 and 1839, was not bound to intervene in an European war. It might be well to quote here an authority deserving of great respect, one who cannot be accused of "apologizing for Germany," and who, in his long diplomatic career, demonstrated frequently the kind of duty an upright man owes to civilization. Wilfred Scawen Blunt, in his book, "My Diaries," puts the case with characteristic English candor:

"The real cause of the quarrel with Germany, I well knew, was no more honorable a one than that of a dread of a too powerful commercial rival and the fear of Kaiser Wilhelm's forcing France, if we stood aside, into commercial alliance with him against us in the markets of the world—that and a gambler's venture, almost desperate, seeing that we were without an army fit to take the field abroad and were dependent on the thousand-and-one chances of the sea for our daily bread at home. In this madness I would take no part.

"That these were the true causes of the War, and not the pretended altruistic ones, I have since acquired a certain knowledge from one of its chief promoters.

"The obligation of fighting in alliance with France in case of a war with Germany concerned the honor of three members only of Asquith's Cabinet, who alone were aware of the exact promises that had been made. These, though given verbally and with reservations as to the consent of Parliament, bound the three as a matter of personal honor, and were understood at the Quai d'Orsay as binding the British nation. Neither Asquith nor his two companions in this inner Cabinet could have retained office had they gone back from their word in spirit or in letter. It would also doubtless have entailed a serious quarrel with the French Government had they failed to make it good. So clearly was the promise understood at Paris to be binding that President Poincaré, when the crisis came, had written to King George reminding him of it as an engagement made between the two nations which he counted on His Majesty to keep.

"Thus faced, the case was laid before the Cabinet, but was found to fail as a convincing argument for war. It was then that Asquith, with his lawyer's instinct, at a second Cabinet brought forward the neutrality of Belgium as a better plea than the other to lay before a British jury, and by representing the Neutrality Treaties of 1831 and 1839 as entailing an obligation on England to fight (of which the text of the treaties contains no word) obtained the Cabinet's consent and war was declared.

"This I have full reason to know was the true history of this astonishing venture, entered on by Asquith through a miscalculation of the military value of Russia, and saved only from supreme disaster by the fighting tenacity of our ignorant boy soldiers, who believed what they were told, and throughout the War pretended that it was one for liberty waged in the defence of weak nations and to set the whole world free."

Mr. Blunt not only knows Downing Street, he knows the class from which England's statesmen and diplomatists are chiefly drawn.

Let us turn now to the letters of the Belgian Ambassadors at London, Paris and Berlin. No professor of political science will go so far as to say that the Belgian Ambassadors in their letters sent before the war to the Belgian Foreign Office, were guilty of "apologizing for Germany." Yet it is impossible after reading these documents to come to any other conclusion other than that they were certain of the policy of encircling Germany being detrimental to the interests of Belgium, and that nothing but war could result from the business. Baron Greindl, Belgian Ambassador at Berlin, wrote, April 18th, 1907:

"Like the treaty of alliance with Japan, the Entente Cordiale with France, and the negotiations pending with Russia, the King of England's visit to the King of Spain is one of the moves in the campaign to isolate Germany, that is being personally directed with as much perseverance as success by His Majesty, King Edward VII."

M. Leghait, the Belgian Ambassador at Paris, wrote, March 6th, 1906, of the visit of Edward VII to Paris, and his fraternizing with M. Delcassé, after the latter's downfall. M. Leghait says:

"Such a mark of courtesy to M. Delcassé at this moment has aroused much comment. It is generally regarded as an act of great significance; baffling, indeed, by reason of the possible extent and seriousness of its consequences.

"In diplomatic circles this demonstration is considered useless and very dangerous at this moment. In French circles it is not over well received; Frenchmen feeling that they are being dragged against their will in the orbit of English policy, a policy whose consequences they dread, and which they generally condemned by throwing over M. Delcassé.

"In short, people fear that this is a sign that England wants so to envenom the situation that war will become inevitable."

Baron Guillaume, the Belgian Ambassador at Paris, wrote, July 2nd, 1911, at the time of the Agadir crisis:

"M. Jaurés is triumphant today. He had all along blamed the Government for involving themselves in a bad business in Morocco, and maintained that there was never any necessity for going to Fez, and that the advance of the French army might become a source of serious embarrassments. There can today be no question that the attitude of the French Government brought about—or at least made possible—the Spanish landing at Larash, and the dispatch of a German man-of-war to Agadir."

A letter from Baron Guillaume to the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, dated March 3rd, 1913, is of extraordinary interest, inasmuch as it refers to a conversation the Baron had in Paris with the German Ambassador:

"On Saturday the German Ambassador said to me: 'The political situation has greatly improved during the last forty-eight hours. There is an all round decrease in tension; a speedy restoration of peace is to be hoped for. But one thing has not improved, and that is the state of public opinion in France and Germany with respect to the relations between the two countries. On our side people are convinced that the spirit of chauvinism being aroused once more in France, a French attack is to be feared. In France they profess to have the same fear with regard to us. The result of these misunderstandings will be a common ruin. I do not know where this perilous path is going to lead us. Is there no man to be found who has sufficient good will and sufficient prestige to appeal to the common sense of all parties? The whole thing is the more absurd, because throughout the whole of the crisis through which we have been passing, both Governments have given evidence of the most peaceful sentiments and have intensely supported each other in order to avoid occasions of conflict.'

"Baron von Schoen is quite right. I am not in a good position to scrutinize public opinion in Germany, but I realize every day the growth of a feeling of suspicion and chauvinism in France.

"Everybody you meet tells you that an early war with Germany is certain and inevitable. It is regretted, but acquisced in. People demand the immediate, one might say, the jubilant passage of any measure calculated to increase France's defensive strength. The most reasonable people maintain that France must arm herself to the teeth, in order to terrify her opponent and so prevent war."

These extracts taken from the letters of the Belgian Ambassadors are an indication of the thought prevalent in the chancelleries before the war. Mr. E. D. Morel, in "Diplomacy Revealed," has given us these letters, and has provided much data explaining the references in them, at the same time supplying the reader with an impartial commentary on military and

naval and other diplomatic developments going on in Europe from the time of the signing of the Anglo-French Agreement.

The military conversations that were carried on in Brussels between the Chief of the Belgian General Staff and the English Military Attaché, Lieut. Col. Barnardiston, with the approval of Major General Grierson, has been dealt with in so many works that it is unnecessary to do more than to refer to the matter. It is clear that there was an understanding among the principals of the British, French and Belgian Staffs, and for anyone to say that the Belgian Government was surprised at the action of Germany is absurd in the light of the information which has been made public in many volumes since the armistice.

Marshal Joffre on the witness stand, before the Metallurgic Committee in Paris, stated that all forces were to be engaged simultaneously, adding that a military convention with Great Britain existed, the terms of which were secret, but nevertheless the aid of six British divisions was counted upon, and also the support of the Belgians.

The result of it all seems to be that Tallyrand's desire to have Belgium under French control has come about, for the Franco-Belgian Military Treaty, recently concluded, places England, the Entente notwithstanding, in the very position that Palmerston sought to avoid by making the treaties of 1831 and 1839. So in considering it a duty to civilization that German arms should be overthrown, we are brought face to face with the very situation which was a nightmare to Canning and Palmerston, and, what is worse, nothing whatever has been done to reduce the armaments of Europe's greatest military Power, or those of her greatest naval Power. FRANCIS NEILSON.

(*Continued.*)

NOCTURNE.

Oh, calm, sweet, delicate, restoring sleep,
What peerless bounty doth thy portals keep!
With wondrous faith I seek thy arms,
Invite thy surcease of the day's alarms,
And trust my spirit in thy gracious care
To rest, a child again, in comfort there.
The night of Life may with grave dangers seek
My piteous spark of being; I bespeak
Thy watchful, tireless guarding till the sun
Streams o'er the world and Time's new prize is won.
I ask thy blessing through the hour
When evil shapes about me tower
And fearsome and most sad to see
My doom stoops close to conquer me.
I tread Earth's hard, unkindly way,
Gray problems fill my mad, brief day;
Creation's battlecry is on my tongue,
And with Man's sorrow I am wrung.
The throbbing, striving heart of me
Dares the stern heights of vast Eternity,
And in my eager, stumbling brain
Pulses a universe of pain.
With thee alone am I content,
I seek thee when the day is spent
As I shall seek that mystic End
That is Man's great, enduring friend,
And while thy wings make dark the sky
In dreamless happiness I lie.

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

CONTRIBUTED

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature

IX.

JOHN RUSKIN.

John Ruskin (1819-1900) was as devoted an interpreter of art as Wagner, and quite as much a critic of existing social and political conditions. At the same time he was as thoroughly revolutionary towards our existing civilization. His early years were largely devoted to art, but from middle age political economy, the conditions of wealth securing and wealth expenditure, came to dominate his thought and his life. Of all the men of his time he was the most desirous of bringing about radical changes in government and in economic conditions.

John A. Hobson, the English economist, says that Ruskin's great work as political economist was to turn the thoughts of his countrymen from a quantitative to a qualitative economy, or in other words to substitute the vital for a pecuniary standard of value. Hobson also says that Ruskin's onslaught upon the mercantile economy of the time was a genuinely scientific criticism. The close connection of the decay of art with faulty social arrangements, says Dean Inge, was Ruskin's discovery. Ugliness in the works of man is a symptom of disease in the state. This was Ruskin's conviction, and we may call it his discovery. C. F. G. Masterman regards Ruskin as a prophet with an extraordinary insight into the conditions of the present time. His books of prophecy show an extraordinary beauty in their constrained style, and in their power to penetrate below the surface and see the spiritual forces at work behind. They are likely to last as long as the world endures.

W. G. Collingwood, Ruskin's biographer, says of the lectures at Oxford, that the brilliancy of the rhetoric, the magic of oratory, the astonishing reaches of thought, were utterly unlike any similar teaching of modern times. It was no imitable trick of intellectual power which transmuted the scribbled jottings of his manuscript for this series into the magnificent flow of rolling paragraph and rounded argument, that thrilled a captious audience with unwonted emotion. Frederic Harrison, who knew Ruskin intimately, and has published an estimate of his character and his work, says of him:

> Not only was he in social intercourse one of the most courteous and sweetest of friends, but he was in manner one of the most fascinating and impressive beings I ever met. I have talked with Carlyle and Tennyson, with Victor Hugo and Mazzini, with Garibaldi and Gambetta, with John Bright and Robert Browning, but no one of these ever impressed me more vividly with a sense of intense personality, with the inexplicable light of genius which seemed to well up spontaneously from heart and brain.

Ruskin began his career at the age of twenty-four with the first volume of his "Modern Painters," which was followed in time by four other volumes under the same title. It was succeeded by "The Seven Lamps of Architecture," "The Stones of Venice," "Pre-Raphaelitism," and other works devoted to the interpretation and criticism of art. His first volume, says Frederic Harrison, "produced a great and immediate sensation," being severely criticized by many, regarded as fanatical, and nothing less than revolu-

tionary. Ruskin's art teachings, however, have come to be very generally accepted, and to be regarded as sound and truthful.

In 1860, when Ruskin had reached the age of forty-one, he turned from art to the interpretation of the problems of political economy. For some years he refused to have his books on art reprinted for the reason that he regarded the problems of wealth as of much more importance. He also wished to force the English to give their attention to economics, and to secure from them a revision of their conceptions of the nature of money-getting and its effects upon the national life. This did not mean that he had abandoned his interest in art, but that he had come to think that art could not thrive wholesomely and truthfully while the national life was given to what was false and debasing in its economic concerns. He rejected the law of demand and supply, as it had been formulated by the economists, as utterly false and debasing.

In 1860 Ruskin published in *The Cornhill Magazine* four lectures on the first principles of political economy, which in 1862 were published in a book entitled "Unto this Last." In the same year appeared "Munera Pulveris," essays on political economy, which originally appeared in *Fraser's Magazine.* Both series of articles were severely condemned by their readers, and the editors of these magazines, Thackeray in the first instance and Froude in the second, were obliged to cancel the arrangements made with the author for their continuance. Other books followed treating of social and economic problems, such as "The Ethics of the Dust," "The Crown of Wild Olive," "Time and Tide" (letters to a working man), and finally a monthly letter to working men entitled "Fors Clavigera," reaching eighty-four numbers, forming eight volumes.

Ruskin assailed the political economy of his time as not giving a true interpretation of economic and commercial conditions, that it ignored the facts, that it did not recognize the true nature of wealth and the processes by which it is secured; and that it failed to account for the waste, injustice and inhumanity of trade, business, and commerce as carried on in the modern world. He condemned the methods by which wealth is secured, and maintained that the taking of rent, interest and profits is unjust and wrong. In his opinion there is no wealth but that which makes for life, the development of manhood, and the increase of human capacity and power. The accumulation of things,—lands, houses, bonds, machines, railroads,—is not real wealth, but merely the means by which wealth of life is to be produced. He insisted that every person should be a worker, and that "all social evils and religious errors arise out of the pillage of the laborer by the idlers." This statement in "Fors" is similar to that in "Pre-Raphaelitism," where he says: "Life without work is robbery; work without art is brutality."

For the conditions of modern industrialism Ruskin had only words of the severest condemnation. They produce dirt, ugliness, disease, broken lives, the degradation and misery of the people. This is shown in every modern city, where slums, crowded houses, vice and crime, indicate all too clearly what our civilization means on its industrial side. Therefore, Ruskin's condemnation of the results of industrial and economic conditions resulted from his ethical conviction that human welfare should be the one supreme test of what is right in the production of wealth. If the workers are kept in ignorance, if they work long hours and under foul conditions, then are the methods employed, whether approved by the economists or not, such as should not be permitted to exist. If the workers are kept in poverty, housed in miserable tenements, and work under corrupting conditions, then is there no justification of the means by which wealth is accumulated. As the result of an intimate study of such conditions Ruskin turned from art to economics, from what is beautiful to what is necessary to life on the part of the people. "For my own part," he wrote in the first volume of "On the Old Road,"

> I feel the force of mechanism and the fury of avaricious commerce to be at present so irresistible, that I have seceded from the study not only of architecture, but nearly of all art; and have given myself, as I would in a besieged city, to seek the best modes of getting bread and butter for its multitude.

Ruskin never worked out systematically and effectively his affirmative and constructive theories. He left them in a fragmentary form, widely scattered through his writings. His first affirmation was that the child should be well born, a capable human being. He insisted that there should be a sanitary regulation of marriage, and that it should be strictly enforced to prevent the extension of disease and physical defect. There should follow a sound education, the highest duty of the state being "to see that every child born therein shall be well housed, clothed, fed, and educated, till it attain years of discretion." The child is to be trained for the condition in life into which it is born, Ruskin holding that some are born to rule and some to serve. He was thoroughly an aristocrat in this respect, insisting that the upper class should act as fathers and guardians of the lower. He was in no sense a democrat, nor did he desire that those who are born to serve should be able to rise above their station. Class distinctions were to him essential, and he would in no way remove them. However, he would honor every man who does his work well, and serves honestly and faithfully in his place. He was more ready to condemn those of the upper class who were delinquent than those who were servants. Those who do the dirty work of the world were born, in his opinion, for that service, and they are fit for that alone.

Above this lowest class rose order after order of workers, and Ruskin would have them organized into Guilds, according to their rank. In his later theories he would have the Guilds undertake many kinds of production, and especially such public works as road building, mining, harbor protection, and the like. He would have the land owned and controlled by the great old families, but they were to have no rent from it, the state providing them with an income. In fact, Ruskin was a State Socialist who retained much of feudalism in his theoretical system. He was, in truth, an aristocratic socialist, his state socialism being modified by the giving of the direction and control of the state into the hands of those born to guide the nation because of their superior capacities. Government, the professions, art and literature, were to be the work of these upper classes, those the best bred, energetic and efficient.

Hobson in his book on Ruskin defines Socialism as "an organic view of social life, which accords to society a unity not constituted of the mere addition

of its individual members, but contained in a common end or purpose, which determines and imposes the activities of these individual members." He adds that in this sense Ruskin is a pronounced Socialist. He would have private enterprise largely abandoned for that which is public, and assigns to the state much of what is now undertaken by the individual. The evils he saw in the society of his time largely arise in what is known as individual initiative, and from business combinations. It is owing to private ownership and enterprise that competition is pushed to an extreme, and thus arises a condition of trade and commerce which Ruskin condemned in the severest terms. He had no word too strong for his disapproval of this battle of business interests with each other in the mad rush for wealth. Ruskin is too often extravagant in his condemnation of modern conditions, though he always desired to do justice to all classes and conditions. In one of his letters he wrote:

> The laborious poor produce the means of life by their labor. Rich persons possess themselves by various expedients of a right to dispense these means of life, and keeping as much means as they want of it for themselves, dispense the rest, usually only in return for more labor from the poor, expended in producing various delights for the rich dispenser.

Ruskin would have the rich persons devote their lives to serving the poor, making easier the tasks of the workers, carefully protecting their interests, making their labors as light as possible. In so far as they fail to act in this fatherly manner to the classes below them, they are failing of their duty as true aristocrats, honor and justice not being in them. Because in modern life, under industrial conditions, the leaders of the state fail in this manner, everything becomes corrupt, and civilization is a blot on the world.

Not only was Ruskin a socialist in his criticism of competition and profitmongering; but he also follows Marx in his constructive economic theory in making labor the basis of the exchange of commodities. An article is worth what it costs in labor, and that should be what is regarded as its value. Those who are living in luxury should invite in the laborer to share with them, and he condemns all those who fail to do this as "no Christians." He admonishes them to "go down among the mad and vile and deaf things whom you have made, and put melody into the souls of them—else you are no Christian."

The socialism of Ruskin much resembles the Guild Socialism of the present time, which may have taken its origin in his teachings, and from the medieval conditions on which he based his theories. In too large a degree, too, Ruskin's socialism was theocratic, and therefore such as commends it to those who desire a churchly control of economic interests.

Ruskin was strongly opposed to the democratic ideas of liberty and equality, and, consistently with this attitude, he was not in favor of any increase of rights for women. Towards women he was most reactionary. He was also an advocate of war as a means of social regeneration. He was by no means wholly opposed to slavery, which he thought was "the inherent, natural, and eternal inheritance" of a considerable portion of the human race. He was not in favor of any coercion of the persons belonging to the servant class, or any subjection of them to base conditions; but he thought it naturally belonged to them to be under the control of their superiors.

Ruskin made several attempts to carry out practically his socialistic ideas. When at Oxford as a lecturer he set the students to making a bad road into a good one as better than their sports. He opened in London a shop for the sale of pure tea at cost price. He made a considerable attempt to revive the old hand industries, being strongly opposed to machine production. He bought land and sold it under favorable conditions to working men and their families. His most serious attempt was the organization of St. George's Guild, in connection with which he sought to realize as much as possible of his socialistic theories. It need not be said that none of these attempts realized more than limited and temporary results. Probably he had no thought that these experiments would accomplish anything final towards overcoming the evils existing in modern society. He was too wise a man to have had any such anticipations.

To a large extent Ruskin was right in his criticisms of modern industrialism and competition. He may have exaggerated at times, but, on the whole, he was true to what he saw around him. When he attempted to provide remedies for these evils he was far from successful. He had by no means freed his mind from the prejudices of his class or from the imposing phases of an age long since passed away. Essentially an aristocrat, believing in privilege and primogeniture, he attempted to phrase a conception of society which should retain all the characteristics of the old aristocracy, but adding to it the most modern notions which are socialistic in their nature. Interesting as this attempt was, with many most suggestive features proposed, it was inevitably a failure. Nevertheless, Ruskin was a man of great originality, a profound lover of his kind, and one earnestly desiring to help forward the evolution of a better social order.

GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

The German Pacifist Student Federation

The German Pacifist Student Federation was first planned in April, 1920, by a small gathering of Berlin University students, under the sponsorship of Professor Ludwig Quidde. Recognizing the vital need of imbuing university students with the spirit of international understanding and reconciliation, the founders set out to galvanize the pacifist sentiment manifested at German universities. In May, 1920, the movement toward federation was publicly launched at a meeting in the largest auditorium of the Berlin University, attended by over 500 persons, and addressed by Prof. Quidde and Pastor Bleier. In the debate following the addresses nationalist and communist speakers tried to win the audience to their ideas, but in vain. The net results were widespread publicity and many new adherents for the pacifists.

Similar movements were already organized at the universities of Freiburg, Hamburg and Frankfurt, and the one in Freiburg was made headquarters of the proposed federation. The Berlin University chapter had established chapters at Berlin Commercial and the University of Munich, and had started work among the students of Jena, Breslau, Königsberg, Münster, Leipsic, Dresden, Halle, Heidelberg and Charlottenburg. These latter centers were taken over by the central organization. A representative was sent to the universities of Stockholm and Upsala, Sweden, and a preliminary organization was effected at the former.

The Berlin chapter, realizing the need of a thorough study of pacifism, organized a kind of seminär on the history of humanitarianism, which became so popular that several such study groups were projected for the following semester, with Prof. Schücking, member of the Reichstag, in charge of one.

The second public meeting in Berlin was a great success. Many interested persons were unable to find even standing room. When, after an address by Dr. Neri, Prof. Nicolai wished to take part in the discussion, nationalist hotheads attempted to prevent him, by raising an uproar, but failed, and Nicolai then had his first public hearing since the first scandalous proceedings at the University, an opportunity which the Prussian ministry had been unable to procure him. The last public appearance of the organization in its first semester was through participation in the gigantic demonstration of the Friends of Peace in front of the Palace, on the first of August.

Meanwhile the student movement was asked to join other pacifist organizations in the Ninth German Pacifist Congress. In connection with this Congress, the German Pacifist Student Federation was founded, embracing chapters at seven universities. Since that time chapters have been organized in Jena, Halle and Leipsic. Negotiations are pending with groups in Breslau, Berlin Technology and Dresden Technology. The effort to organize Bonn failed.

The first half of the second semester was lost in bureaucratic bickerings. Rector Seckel forbade public meetings in the University of Berlin. But the Federation got around this difficulty by arranging for three public meetings, two outside the University, to be addressed by Count Kessler and Dr. Hiller, and one exclusively for members of the university student body, to be addressed inside the university by Prof. Nicolai, whom not even the Rector can forbid the use of the university.

When the elections were held for representatives in the Berlin University Student Parliament, the Pacifist chapter did not run its own candidates, but seven of its members were elected, as representatives of other student organizations. The president of the Freiberg chapter was invited to The Hague to attend the Anti-Militarist Congress to be held there at Easter. He was also appointed to help organize an International Student Congress to be held in Prague.

Funds for expansion in other countries are still lacking, but contributions have been sent from Denmark and Sweden. David Starr Jordan has taken an active interest in the movement, and the Federation has appealed to Henry Ford for financial support. The organizers are getting in touch with pacifist societies and organs in various countries, and have been accorded friendly recognition by the League of Nations. Affiliation with the Berne Peace Bureau is now under advisement. The official organ of the federation is *Die Menschheit,* published in Stuttgart.

ALFRED SCHNEYDER.

Berlin-Friedenau, Cranachstrasse 36.
Translated by Professor William A. Cooper, Stanford University.

"You must seek knowledge. Knowledge will not seek you."—*Madame Curie.*

The Wisdom of the Peoples

IV. THE PROVERBS OF CHINA.

The greatest conqueror is he who overcomes the enemy without a blow.

Where palaces are magnificent fields will be poor and granaries empty.

He that does not believe in others finds they do not believe in him.

A vacant mind is open to all suggestions as a hollow building echoes all sounds.

The best soldiers are not warlike.

The greater the number of laws, the more thieves there will be.

Buildings are measured by their shadows and great men by their calumniators.

One actor cannot make a play.

Unjust wealth is like snow sprinkled with hot water.

Better do a good deed near at home than go far away to burn incense.

The poorer one is, the most devils one meets.

Sitting alone, meditate on your own faults; in conversation, talk not of other men's.

Money goes to the gambling house as criminals go to execution.

One's good deeds are only known at home; one's bad deeds far away.

In shallow water dragons become the joke of shrimps.

Do not lace your shoes in a melon field nor adjust your hat under a plum tree, if you would avoid suspicion.

That the wicked have plenty to eat is no indication of the approval of Heaven.

One can never buy all the wine that is for sale.

The palest ink is better than the most retentive memory.

If you do not scale the mountain, you cannot view the plain.

Better not do kindnesses at all than do them in the hope of recompense.

Look not at thieves eating flesh, but look at them suffering punishment.

A gem is not polished without rubbing nor a man perfected without trials.

A four-horse chariot cannot overtake the spoken word.

To be fond of learning is to be at the gate of knowledge.

Just scales and a full measure injure no man.

Talking about virtue is not so good as practicing it.

He who has just been put in charge of an Imperial Granary sits up every night to boil rice for himself.

With coarse food to eat, water to drink, and the bended arm as a pillow, happiness may still exist.

A man must insult himself before others will.

If a horse gets no wild grass he never becomes fat; if a man does not receive lucky help he never becomes rich.

Let a dog bite a scholar and no one cares, but if a scorpion sting a mandarin sympathizers come in such crowds as to break down the doors.

If you want your children to lead a quiet life let them always be a little hungry and cold.

You can hardly make a friend in a year, but you can easily offend one in an hour.

You honor dead Buddhas, but the living Buddhas you do not honor.

An honest magistrate has lean clerks; a powerful god has fat priests.

When men are friendly even water is sweet.

Virtue and vice are the outward acts; misery and happiness the recompense.

Good and evil are rewarded at last, though we travel far and fly high in our effort to escape.

Let everyone sweep away the snow from his own door and not meddle with the frost on his neighbor's tiles.

When your money is spent you cut off wine; when growing old you turn to the sacred books.

Neither indulge a slave nor deceive a child.

Following virtue is a steep ascent; following vice a precipitous leap.

Be forgetful of favors given; be mindful of blessings received.

One wrong thought may cause a lifelong regret.

If you are poor, keep out of the crowd; if unfortunate don't seek a relation.

Let there be plenty of food and clothing and propriety and righteousness will flourish.

It is only kindness and not severity which can impress at the distance of a thousand miles.

To save one man's life is better than to build a seven-storied pagoda.

Never burn false incense before a true god.

Those who know the truth are not equal to those who love it, and they who love it are not equal to those who find pleasure in it.

It is harder to be poor without murmuring than to be rich without arrogance.

It is easier to capture a tiger in the mountains than to ask for a loan of money.

A poor man associating with a rich man will soon be poorer still.

The loftiest towers rise from the ground.

A poor man dwells unnoticed in the market-place; a rich man will be visited by his distant relatives though living in the far-off hills.

True gold fears no fire.

If you believe in gambling you will have to sell your house.

The man whose conscience is easy will never fear a knock on the door at midnight.

To meet an old friend in a distant country is like the delight of rain after long drought.

The pleasure of doing good is the only one that will not wear out.

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

TWO LACQUER PRINTS.

THE EMPEROR'S GARDEN

Once, in the sultry heat of midsummer,
An Emperor caused the miniature mountains in his garden
To be covered with white silk,
That so crowned,
They might cool his eyes
With the sparkle of snow.

MEDITATION

A wise man,
Watching the stars pass across the sky,
Remarked:
In the upper air the fireflies move more slowly.

—*Amy Lowell.*

THE BOOK TABLE

The East of Romance

Is the trend of fiction a true indication of the urgent problems of the hour? If so, it would seem that we are at last awakening to the importance of the Orient in our life and policy. For stories of all kinds, relating to the Orient or dealing with Oriental themes, are issuing from our presses. Three such, from good houses, lie before us.

*Seed of the Sun,** by Wallace Irwin, is the cry of the Californian. A "fifth large printing" has just come out, which shows that it is being read. The cover advertisement repeats Kipling's somewhat threadbare dictum—"East Is East and West Is West, and never the twain shall meet." This novel shows how they met—and what happened. It is a story of the invasion of California. It is a tale of Oriental intrigue. The Mikado is the personal instigator and the successful profiteer of the intrigue. A war widow tried to raise prunes and was crowded out. The writer produces a plausible, a heart-moving tale. He seems to aim to be just to the good qualities of the Japanese, but leaves their bad ones in high relief. His argument is, however, not quite clear. Would we welcome and love the Japanese if they were Christians? That seems at times his attitude. But we do not welcome and love the negroes who are excellent Christians. Is his terror that of miscegenation? So it appears at times. But, while the Eurasian Henry is the chief fool in the story, he is on the whole saner than most of the other actors. We do not quarrel with the author's hostility to mixed marriage. The well-worn query—would *you* marry your daughter to a negro? Would you wish *your* daughter to marry a Chink?—is usually a clincher. If we had a daughter, we would be sorry to have her marry an Italian or a Frenchman, a Russian, an Irishman or an Englishman; in fact, we would not wish her to marry any one of a lot of Americans we have met. To whom one would wish to marry his daughter has no bearing upon this question of Japanese in California, but the query silences the opponent. Irwin's story clearly shows how Japanese move onto, and Americans move off of, pleasant spots. Is not California most interesting in its stratification of population? The Indian lived there quite happily in his easy-going way. He lost to the Mexican because he could not be left in possession of a soil, which he so crudely utilized. Mexico lost half her territory, because she did not keep up with the world's progress and adequately occupy and develop. We crowded in because impatient at such waste; our plea and excuse were that natural resources and opportunities should be fully utilized. If Mr. Irwin's story is true to life, it looks as if our principle were again being applied. We are neither ignorant of the situation, nor unsympathetic. The California problem is a difficult one. Both parties are involved in a serious and trying situation. It is not easy to see a solution that shall be truly just. But it is well to realize how the Indian *felt*, how he looked on in bitter helplessness, while he was being dispossessed. So of the Spanish-Mexican holder; his yielding was one of rage, unhappiness, hatred. Mr. Irwin paints a sad picture of intrigue and

* "Seed of the Sun." Wallace Irwin. New York: 1921. George H. Doran Co. 16mo. pp. 352.

cunning plotting in the present invasion; a skilful Indian or Mexican writer could have shown equally skilful or cunning scheming in the earlier incomings. In all of these movements of displacement, the actual settlers have acted as individuals, unconscious of the parts they played in a directed game; but it is they and the victims they displaced, who suffered in the process.

Samuel Merwin's *In Red and Gold*† voices no opposition to miscegenation. We have met the hero of the store before, in *Hills of Han;* he is Griggsby Doane, Ex-missionary. Having had his intellectual and spiritual struggles, having eaten of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, having dropped out of his old environment, he has begun a new life as the mate of a river-steamboat. Somehow, since we last met him, he has acquired a deep knowledge of Chinese philosophic thought and an expert appreciation of Chinese art. He is still the superman. The scene of the story is the Chinese river; the events are related to the outbreak of the revolution that drove the Manchus from power and inaugurated the great republic. The characters are mostly foreigners such as trade and exploitation bring together in unhappy China; they are a disagreeable lot, little creditable to the America of their origin. Adventurers, depraved and desperate, they are ready to seize upon any gamble that promises. They include a great American financier, his spoiled and filthy-minded son (who gives promise of decency on occasion), a Shanghai prostitute, gamblers and crooks. A Chinese official of the highest rank, his lovely daughter (educated in Western schools) and Doane are pitted against these. There is love—both impetuous and restrained—theft, robbery, insurrection, arson and murder in the story. No one of the characters succeeds in his undertakings and the sympathies of the reader are never fully satisfied. Even in the end, which is distressingly peaceful and calm after the horrors and excitements through which we have been carried, we feel that we have been lured on by false hopes. The book is a vivid presentation of the extraordinary conditions of the Far East, where the rustlers and hungry western adventurer is trying to get pickings while they are easy. It is a sad but true picture of the contact between unlike races, cultures and civilizations. Though the characters are extreme and disagreeable, they are well drawn. The appreciation of Chinese civilization and the rendering of Chinese life and thought are keen. After reading the book, we are less sure that we are "helping China," less sure that our own civilization and religion are altogether admirable.

Mrs. Miln's book‡ also treats of the meeting of the West and East in China. The heroine, here as in Merwin's story, is a Chinese girl of high class, fine character, and western education. The picture of Chinese life, culture and psychology is detailed and appreciative. The author knows her China from intimate contact and gives a true impression of its best features. She seems at times somewhat didactic and too detailed in her miniature painting. The story is one of love, and of duty. The scene is laid in China and in England. Here again the ardent lover is the white man, but here there is no culmination in a mixed marriage. The opposition, however, comes from the Oriental, not the Occidental, scruple. The finest character in the book is the old lady, head of the great house of Cheng. The heroine falls far short of her in character, in ideals, in action. We do not really see how she fulfills the prophecy, which is the central idea of the book. What is there in her achievement that meets the earlier promises? The story has interest. It presents Chinese ideals with sympathetic affection. One is left with the feeling that they may hold their own even in the face of the deadly assault now being made by the materialistic and selfish West.

FREDERICK STARR.

† "In Red and Gold." Samuel Merwin. Indianapolis: 1921. The Bobbs-Merrill Co. 16mo. pp. (iii) 352.

‡ "The Feast of Lanterns." Louise Jordan Miln. New York: 1920. Frederick A. Stokes Co. 16mo. pp. (iii) 304.

SELECTED

National Purification

The national week is the week of purification. . . . Purification is purification only when it is voluntary. And the way to freedom lies not through compulsion but sweetness, persuasion and humility. I hope that those who can will devote these two days specially to fasting and praying. For remember that this is a battle of freedom. In this we do not invoke the assistance of gunpowder but assistance of God. During that week you will search your hearts from within. You will fight with all your might against the drink cause.

One indispensable sign of purity is that every man considers every woman as his own sister and mother, every woman considers every man as her brother and father. . . . If we want Dharmaraj and not Rakshasaraj you will agree with me that personal purity is as essential as national purity. Our Swaraj consists not in self-indulgence but in self-restraint. I hope that you will devote the national week to expediting the program that has been laid to you by the All-India Congress Committee. I hope that during that week you will make still greater efforts to make Hindu-Mussulman unity a solid thing. And I hope that during that week you will for every one of yourselves and for others make it absolutely certain that India's freedom is dependent purely on non-violence. And you will understand that an angry word uttered against our own countrymen who may not hold the same view as we do, and every word uttered against an Englishman, sticks waved against a single person who might have harmed us is also violence contrary to the precept laid down to us by the Congress. And unless we remove the fear of violence from the meanest of our countrymen and from the least of the foreigners that may be residing in our midst, we may not be called a nation for democracy. And we commit a satanic breach of non-violence when we consider a single man as untouchable, when we consider that a single man in India even though he may be a leper or a pariah, that his touch pollutes, that his shadow takes away Vaitshnavite or Shaivite purity. The teaching of the Bhagvad Gita is absolutely as clear as daylight. It enjoins upon us to treat Brahman and Chandala with the same love, with the same spirit of brotherhood. A Brahman ceases to be a Brahman when he considers a single man as inferior to him. One of the sweetest names for God that human loftiness has invented—*Dasanudasa,* Servant of the Servants. And it is time that India got rid of this curse of untouchability.

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

FREDERICK STARR BACK FROM JAPAN.

Readers of UNITY will be glad to find that Prof. Starr resumes in this issue his contributions to The Book Table. He returned in June from a six months' trip to Japan. Leaving Chicago on December 23, he sailed from Seattle by the *Hawaii Maru* on December 28, and reached Yokohama on January 18, five days behind schedule on account of rough weather. The purpose of the expedition was to collect material piecing out the results of earlier journeys rather than to undertake new investigations. Four items, however, stand out rather conspicuously: (a) several days were spent at Ayabe, studying the *Omoto-Kyo*, a recent development of Shinto, which is giving the Japanese government some concern. Prof. Starr was received into one of the student dormitories and had every opportunity to study the doctrines and practices of the sect. It is highly mystical and its head claims to be at once the incarnation of the ancient Shinto deities, Buddha and Jesus. (b) The long-planned pilgrimage of the "88 sacred places of Shikoku" was carried through. This pilgrimage was laid out eleven hundred years ago by the famous Kobo Daishi. This great scholar and priest is a favorite with Prof. Starr and the journey was made out of respect to his memory and to come into intimate contact with the island where the saint was born and lived and in which his memory is still cherished. The pilgrimage involved a journey of a thousand miles and presented considerable difficulty as many of the temples are on summits not easy of access. The Shingon priests were everywhere most cordial and every opportunity was given the foreign non-Buddhist pilgrim to see and learn. Thirty-five days were devoted to this journey. During its course, twenty-six addresses were given by request, upon Buddhist themes, or on international relations. (c) In response to the request of the Hosso priests, who had the celebration in hand, Prof. Starr attended the celebration of the thirteen hundredth anniversary of the death of Shotoku Taishi, which took place at the ancient temple of Horiuji from April 11 to 17. It was a function of exceptional interest and significance. (d) A brief visit was made to Korea, to see the conditions now existing there. This is the fifth time that Prof. Starr has been in that peninsula since its absorption by Japan. Having seen the administrations of General Terauchi and of Count Hasegawa, he desired to see that of Baron Saito. Many Koreans were seen and heard and as much was learned as the shortness of the time available would permit.

In addition to these special items, a large amount of material was gathered about Mount Fuji, the Fuji-Ko, Japanese toys, Yamabushi, and other subjects already under investigation. Some of this material will be used in three public exhibitions that are planned—of Mount Fuji, of Japanese toys, and of the early contact between Japan and other countries. On February 12, Lincoln's Birthday, Prof. Starr was the guest of honor at the annual dinner of the University of Chicago Club of Tokyo, made up about equally of Japanese and Americans. When he left the United States, he intended to do no public speaking. However, in addition to the 26 addresses in Shikoku, he was called upon to speak elsewhere. Thus addresses were given to three interesting and inspiring groups of Koreans at Seoul, and six audiences were addressed at Osaka and Tokyo. On the journey homeward the steamer stopped some hours at Honolulu, where an address was given at the Shingon Mission upon *Kobo Daishi* and at the University Club upon Japan and the United States. Prof. Starr reached San Francisco, by the *Persia Maru* on June 14. That night he was guest of the University of Chicago Club at San Francisco, and on June 17 of the Denver University of Chicago Club. During his stay in Japan, he had the assistance in interpretation and photography, of Maebashi Hambei (his helper for ten years) and Ikeda Jutaro, who accompanied him upon the Shikoku pilgrimage and the Korean trip. Prof. Starr resumed work at the University upon June 21.

HOW MAY JAPAN AVOID WAR WITH THE UNITED STATES.

"Is it impossible to avoid war between Japan and America?" asks the *Yomiuri* of Tokyo "There is no sense," the daily contends, "in playing ostrich by hiding difficulty under suave, diplomatic lying. Much better it is to face the fact squarely and attempt to cure the sore spots. War between America and Japan is more than probable if the present mutual irritation be allowed to continue.

"There is more than one factor which is at once responsible for the ill-feeling between Japan and America. For Japan, such factors are the California question and America's naval expansion. From America's point of view the main cause of the trouble is Japan's policy towards China and Siberia, which is believed to be emblematic of Japan's militarism. Such causes lead to the armament race between the two countries and their struggle for supremacy in the Pacific.

"Such being the case, mutual agreement for naval reduction does away with one-half of the cause of the tension. Diplomatic understanding over the California situation and Japan's Far Eastern policy will dispose of the other half. There is no other method of averting war with America than mutually to restrict armament and establish a thorough understanding."

[Sent by Lucia Ames Mead from *East and West News Bulletin.*]

And now a word especially to the dear sisters who have assembled. Wherever I have traveled the women of India have treated me with affection. And wherever I have gone I have asked from you blessing for myself and for Maulana Shaukat Ali. And I ask you to give us the blessings that other sisters have given us. And, you know, what we want the blessing for. We are fighting the battle of freedom and of India's religions. . . . Our Shastras have given me the assurance that the blessings of a pure woman can never go wrong. And I want you to be armed with the same purity that Sita possessed. And if you are fired with the same spirit of Sita you will not hesitate to tell your husbands or fathers that you don't want ornaments for your pleasure, either their pleadings in the courts or services in their offices. And tell them that your strong arms and nimble fingers will work at the spinning wheel. You will tell them that the fruits of your labors will supplement the earnings that your husbands, brothers and fathers may bring home. . . . And, if with a pure heart and bodies undefiled by foreign garments you give us blessings, I know I have every confidence that we get Dharma Raj during this year. I want you to give me out of the fullness of your hearts, not out of shame whatever ornaments you would, whatever money you would. This money will be spent in taking spinning wheels to poor homes and in educating poor boys. You and I may not deck ourselves with ornaments or with fine dress so long as there is a single man or woman who has to get his or her food or clothing. I thank you for giving me such a patient hearing.

You understand now that all our speeches and our resolutions are addressed to ourselves. Unlike as of old our speeches, our resolutions now require us to do something rather than government. I would ask you to give me at least one ocular demonstration that you are all intent upon attaining Swaraj. I will ask you to give whatever you can to the volunteers who will presently go into your midst whether it is a pie or one rupee or whether bangle or ornament—all these things will be helpful for winning Swaraj if voluntarily given —and with a determination to get Swaraj. I want nothing out of shame, nor out of compulsion. I am satisfied with a pie as I am satisfied with millions. May God grant you courage and ability to go through the discipline that is required of you during this year. . .

Gandhi.

The World and the New Dispensation.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

- -

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY

700 Oakwood Boulevard Chicago, Illinois

$3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription to UNITY, or 50 cents for a ten weeks' trial subscription to UNITY. Single copies, 10 cents.

Name .....City .....

Street .....State .....